DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 223 HE 013 521

AUTHOR Dunwell, Robert R.
TITLE The Work Group Survey: Assessing Organizational Climate in Higher Education.
PUB DATE 19 Feb 81
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (33rd, February 19, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization: Administrators: *College Faculty: *Faculty College Relationship: Group Dynamics: Higher Education: Institutional Research: *Interprofessional Relationship: Measurement Techniques: *Organizational Climate: Research Methodology: School Personnel: Self Evaluation (Groups): State Universities: Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Collegiality: *Southeast Missouri State University

ABSTRACT

The organizational climate of Southeast Missouri State University was assessed as part of an institutional self-study, and the appropriateness and effectiveness of the research instrument were evaluated. Twenty-five characteristics identified by Likert (1961, 1967) as descriptive of highly effective work groups were used as a framework for the assessment of organizational climate. The Likert characteristics were abstracted to provide effective survey items, and a five-point response scale was developed for rating the characteristics. The presence of these characteristics were determined at three organizational levels: the primary work group, the college or major administrative unit, and the university in general. The survey instrument, entitled The Work Group Survey, is appended. The study population was all full-time and part-time faculty, administrators, support professional, technical, and clerical personnel, excluding graduate assistants, service personnel, and crafts and trades personnel. Typically, primary work groups were perceived to be highly effective units in which individuals strive for harmonious working relationships, strive to meet group expectations, are likely to accept group values, enjoy well-established and relaxed working relationships. Typically, colleges and major administrative units were perceived to reflect characteristics similar to primary work groups but at a level effective only to some extent. The university in general was perceived to reflect the same characteristics as colleges and major administrative units but at a level somewhat less effective. More specific analyses are presented. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201223

THE WORK GROUP SURVEY:

ASSESSING ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

IN HIGHER EDUCATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert R Dunwell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Vanguard Session No. 54

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

33rd Annual Meeting

Thursday, February 19, 1981

Dr. Robert R. Dunwell

Chairperson, Department of Education

Southeast Missouri State University

Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63701

HE 013 521

THE WORK GROUP SURVEY: ASSESSING ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Robert R. Dunwell

In a concerted effort to improve accreditation in higher education, Semrow has defended the institutional self-study (1) because it relies on the institution to develop a flexible and eclectic approach incorporating both objective and subjective measures, and (2) because it enables the accrediting commission "to incorporate dynamic values of growth, change, (and) planning to replace static qualities represented...(by) norms, standards or other purely descriptive, proscriptive, or prescriptive approaches..." (1978, p. 6)

At the same time, he sharply critized the accreditation process:

(1) Self-studies are largely descriptive rather than evaluative;

(2) Institutional evaluation tends to be spasmodic, if not convulsive, and not continuous;

(3) Institutions do not relate self-study to other evaluative or reporting needs;

(4) The absence of adequate guidelines and criteria leaves the process open to biases, methodological confusion and diminuation of trust and confidence (Semrow, 1978).

The shift from exclusive use of objective standards toward continuous evaluation utilizing both objective and subjective measures acknowledges that even massive compilation of traditional data frequently fails to reveal internal factors that influence or control organizational effectiveness.

However, Semrow's analysis of the literature (1979) indicated that the search for an application of useable assessment and evaluation schemes was the weakest part of self-studies and on-site team reports. Searching for reasons for this omission, Semrow has referred to Cameron's conclusions: (1) information on effectiveness is not usually collected by colleges and universities, (2) evaluation of institutional effectiveness engenders skepticism and defensiveness in the academic community, (3) research has focused on financial efficiency rather than organizational effectiveness, and (4), in high education, the theoretical bases of the concept of effectiveness have been questioned (Cameron, 1978).

One major address to the measurement of organizational effectiveness may be found in efforts to assess organizational climate, the feeling tones that influence the interpersonal interactions among members of work groups. This approach is based on (1) the premise that factors such as communication, norms, expectations, cohesiveness, and leadership determine or directly influence organizational effectiveness, (2) the fact that highly effective organizations demonstrate the presence of certain sets of interpersonal interactions, and (3) deliberate efforts to improve the quality of these sets of interpersonal interactions has a positive effect on the effectiveness of the organization.

Finding an appropriate means to assess organizational climate has occupied serious researchers for several decades. Since Halpin and Croft's major effort in 1963, attempts to assess organizational climate of schools have become more common (Halpin, 1967; Pfeiffer and Heslin, 1973; Fox, et al., 1975; Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1979). Three major trends have influenced these efforts: (1) the scope of inquiry has expanded as a greater number of elements have been identified (Harrison, 1975; Harrison and Oshry, 1976;

Gibb, 1977; Hausser, et al., 1979); (2) the process technically has become less sophisticated as consultants have encouraged self-appraisal by members within an organization (Pfeiffer and Heslin, 1973; Francis and Woodcock, 1975); and (3) collateral efforts in business and industry continue to contribute little to educational assessment because they are based on assumptions not necessarily relevant to the educational enterprise.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study were (1) to develop an instrument to assess the organizational climate of a university, (2) to analyze obtained responses as part of an institutional self-study, and (3) to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of the instrument as an assessment tool.

Developing the Instrument

The review of literature failed to disclose an available instrument suitable to assess organizational climate in an institution of higher education. However, Likert (1961, 1967) synthesized extensive research findings on the productivity of various types of organizations to describe the characteristics of highly effective work groups (pp. 166-169). Conceptually, these characteristics describe the interaction-influence system among members of an organization. The characteristics appeared congruent with the elements typically identified as part of organizational climate. Taken as a whole, the twenty-five characteristics appeared to provide a framework for the assessment of organizational climate.

Using Likert's characteristics of highly effective work groups as a model, the experimental instrument was constructed (1) by carefully abstracting each characteristic to form a base item brief enough and clear enough to encourage response, (2) developing a five-point response scale

to display the extent to which each characteristic was perceived present in the environment, and (3) differentiating the presence of these characteristics at three organizational levels: (a) the primary work group, (b) the college or major administrative unit, and (c) the university in general. Instructions and identification codes were structured to foster maximum anonymity. The survey instrument, titled The Work Group Survey, is included as Appendix A.

The Subject Population

The population selected for study was all full-time and part-time faculty, administrators, support professional, technical and clerical personnel at the subject university (N = 739). Subgroups within the population are identified in Table 1.

Table 1
Subject Population by Classification

Classification	Number
Full-time faculty	396
Part-time faculty	57
Administrative/Executive	40
Support professional	88
Technical	24
Clerical	134
Total	739

Excluded from the study were graduate assistants (N = 66), service personnel (N = 132), and crafts and trades personnel (N = 55). The decision to limit the population deliberately weighed attendent advantages/ disadvantages.

Administration of the Survey

The Work Group Survey was conducted as one of three parts of the institutional self-study process. Survey forms with separate answer sheets were distributed through instructional support unit offices to all members of that unit with instructions to forward completed answer sheets to a central office. Return rates are noted in Table 2.

Table 2
Survey Responses by Major Groups

Group	Population	Response	Level
Instructional units	568	356	62.7%
Support units	171	137	80.1%
Totals	739	493	66.7%

Two major factors appear to have suppressed the return rate: (1) This survey, plus two other self-study surveys, was conducted in a two-week period near the end of Spring Semester 1980. At the same time, the faculty senate conducted an independent survey on faculty governance. Faculty voiced negative reactions to the number of requests for information. (2) Although the instrument was designed to foster anonymity, some individuals omitted all descriptive information. The obtained level of returns placed some distinct limits on the certainty of conclusions which may be drawn from the data. Any assessment of this nature should strive for a near unanimous response to assure adequacy; however, for purposes here, the return rate is seen as a function of the survey process rather than a problem of the instrument design.

Treatment of the Data

Responses to each of the twenty-five characteristics for each level of organization (primary work group, college or major administrative unit, and university in general) were tabulated for each descriptive category of respondents and the percent of total responses in each category computed. In the case of each of the instructional and support units, identification was omitted, units randomized and frequencies of response deleted to prevent identification of the unit.

The item response scale, numerical values, and verbal descriptors assigned these values are shown in Table 3. If the presence of the several

Table 3
Derivation of Response Descriptors
From Item Response Scale

Category	Scales				
Item Response Scale	TO A VERY LITTLE EXTENT	TO A LITTLE EXTENT	TO SOME EXTENT	TO A GREAT EXTENT	TO A VERY GREAT EXTENT
Item Response Value	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00
Item Response Intervals	1.00-1.49	1.50-2.49	2.50-3.49	3.50-4.49	4.50-5.00
Response Descriptors	LESS EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE TO SOME EXTENT	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	

characteristics were perceived at 3.50 or above, "to a great extent" or "to a very great extent," operationally the unit was considered to be "highly effective." If the characteristic were present "to some extent," values from 2.50 to 3.49, operationally the unit was considered to be

"effective to some extent." Values below 2.49 were described as "less effective."

Findings

Responses of the Total Group

Primary work groups. In the primary work groups, twenty-two of the twenty-five characteristics were perceived at the "highly effective" level, three at the level considered "effective to some extent". The five highest and five lowest mean values were ranked to differentiate most common and least common characteristics and displayed in Table 4.

Typically, primary work groups were perceived to be highly effective units in which individuals strive for harmonious working relationships, strive to meet group expectations, are likely to accept group values, enjoy well-established, relaxed working relationships, and try to help each other do the best possible job. Primary work groups are not perceived to be as effective in supporting attempts to achieve beyond normal expectations, in dealing with group leadership, or in dealing differentially with important/unimportant information.

Colleges and major administrative units. For this level of organization, five characteristics were perceived present at the "highly effective" level, twenty at the level considered "effective to some extent". Most common and least common characteristics were ranked in a similar manner and displayed in Table 5.

Typically, colleges and major administrative units were perceived to reflect characteristics similar to primary work groups but at a level effective only to some extent.

The university in general. For this level of organization, only one characteristic was perceived present at the "highly effective" level,

Table 4
Most Common and Least Common Characteristics
of Primary Work Groups
By All Respondents (N = 492)

Rank	Mean Score	Characteristic
1	4.00	In working with others, members of my group try to work in harmony with the members of other groups.
2	3.99	Each member tries not to let other members down and tries hard to do what he believes is expected of him.
3	3.96	The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.
4	3.90	The group has developed a well-established, relaxed working relationship among all its members.
5	3.85	The group shares technical knowledge and training to help each member do the best possible job.
21	3.53	On technical matters, methods, organizational problems and group processes, members try to influence each other and are open to influence by other members.
22	3.52	Each member communicates important information fully and frankly to the group.
23	3.22	The group gives attention to important information and avoids unimportant information that wastes a group's time.
24	3.14	The leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader.
25	3.05	The leader and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible", but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.

Table 5
Most Common and Least Common Characteristics
Of Colleges or Major Administrative Units
By All Respondents (N = 492)

Rank	Mean Score	Characteristic
1	3.68	The group accepts the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies on routine matters to save time and move ahead.
2	3.66	In working with others, members of my group try to work in harmony with the members of other groups.
3	3.63	Each member tries not to let the other members down and tries hard to do what he believes is expected of him.
4	3.61	The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.
5	3.51	Each member is interested in receiving important information and accepts it as being honestly and sincerely given.
21	3.18	Members feel good about making decisions for themselves because members clearly understand what the group is trying to get done.
22	3.14	Each member communicates important information fully and frankly to the group.
23	3.07	Members feel free to communicate information to the leader, to suggest what needs to be done, and to suggest how the leader could do his job better.
24	2.92	The leader and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible", but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.
25	2.80	The leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader.

twenty-four characteristics at the level described as "effective to some extent". Most common and least common characteristics were ranked and displayed in Table 6. The university in general was perceived to reflect the same characteristics as colleges and major administrative units but at a level somewhat less effective than colleges and major administrative units.

Comparison of primary work groups with colleges and major administrative units. For each characteristic, the difference between its perceived presence in primary work groups and in colleges and major administrative units was determined. Greatest and least differences are displayed in Table 7.

The decline in the perceived level of effectiveness of colleges and major administrative units appeared to be related to a reduced presence of: (1) relaxed working relationship, (2) sharing information to help the member do the best job, (3) feeling free to communicate to the leader, (4) effectiveness in communication and interaction, (5) confidence and trust in one another, and (6) a supportive atmosphere. Primary work groups and colleges and major administrative units were least different in (1) their acceptance of the need for standard administrative practices and policies, (2) their difficulty in dealing differentially with important/unimportant information, and (3) the limited support for attempts to achieve beyond usual expectations.

Comparison of colleges and major administrative units with the university in general. In a similar manner, greatest and least differences between these two levels of organization were determined and displayed in Table 8. The preceived level of effectiveness of the university in general was lower than colleges and major administrative units; the reduction was related to a similar set of characteristics. Other characteristics contributing to the reduced level of effectiveness of the university in general were: (1) the constraint on sharing information fully and frankly, (2) the absence of an

Table 6
Most Common and Least Common Characteristics
Of the University in General
By All Respondents (N = 492)

Rank	Mean Score	Characteristic
1	3.52	The group accepts the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies on routine matters to save time and move ahead.
2	3.43	The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.
3	3.38	In working with others, members of my group try to work in harmony with the members of other groups.
4	3.36	Each member tries not to let the other members down and tries hard to do what he believes is expected of him.
5	3.25	Each member is interested in receiving important information and accepts it as being honestly and sincerely given.
21.5	2.83	Group members are effective in communication and interaction between leaders-and-members and members-and-members.
21.5	2.83	The leader and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible", but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.
23	2.82	Each member communicates important information fully and frankly to the group.
24	2.76	Members feel free to communicate information to the leader, to suggest what needs to be done, and to suggest how the leader could do his job better.
25	2.57	The leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader.

Table 7
Greatest and Least Differences
Between Primary Work Groups
and Colleges and Major Administrative Units

Rank	Greatest Difference	Item No.	Item
1	.55	2	The group has developed a well-established, relaxed working relationship among all its members.
2	.53	12	The group shares technical knowledge and training to help each member do the best possible job.
3	.50	22	Members feel free to communicate information to the leader, to suggest what needs to be done, and to suggest how the leader could do his job better.
4	.46	1	Group members are effective in the communication and interaction between leaders-and-members and between members-and-members.
5.5	.45	4	The members and the leader have a high degree of confidence and trust in each other.
5.5	.45	11	The leader of the work group creates a supportive atmosphere and fosters cooperation rather than competition; for example information is shared fully with the group.

Rank	Least Difference	Item No.	Item
1.5	.04	17	The group accepts the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies on routine matters to save time and move ahead.
1.5	.04	19	The group gives attention to important information and avoids unimportant information that wastes the group's time.
3	.13	14	The leaders and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible", but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.

Table 8
Greatest and Least Differences
Between Colleges and Major Administrative Units
and the University in General

Rank	Greatest Difference	Item No.	Item
1	.42	1	Group members are effective in the communication and interaction between leaders-and-members and between members-and-members.
2	.40	2	The group has developed a well-established, relaxed working relationship among all its members.
3.5	.32	12	The group shares technical knowledge and training to help each member do the best possible job.
3.5	.32	18	Each member communicates important information fully and frankly to the group.
6	.31	10	Group atmosphere is sufficiently supportive for the members to accept criticism and use it constructively; members are frank and candid, but feel secure.
6	.31	16	The group values new, creative approaches to its problems and to the problems of the organization of which it is a part.
6	.31	22	Members feel free to communicate information to the leader, to suggest what needs to be done, and to suggest how the leader could do his job better.

Rank	Least Difference	Item No.	Item
1	.09	14	The leader and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible", but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.
2.5	.16	3	The members are attracted to the group and loyal to its members and to its leader.
2.5	.16	17	The group accepts the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies on routine matters to save time and move ahead.
4	,19	7	The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.

Table 9
Greatest and Least Differences
Between Primary Work Groups
and the University in General

Rank	Greatest Difference	Item No.	Item
1	.95	2	The group has developed a well-established, relaxed working relationship among all its members.
2	.88	1	Group members are effective in the communication and interaction between leaders-and-members and between members-and-members.
3	.85	12	The group shares technical knowledge and training to help each member do the best possible job.
4	.81	22	Members feel free to communicate information to the leader, to suggest what needs to be done, and to suggest how the leader could do his job better.
5	.73	11	The leader of the work group creates a supportive atmosphere and fosters cooperation rather than competition; for example, information is shared fully with the group.

Rank	Least Difference	Item No.	Item
1	.20	17	The group accepts the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies on routine matters to save time and move ahead.
2	.22	14	The leader and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible", but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.
	.27	19	The group gives attention to important information and avoids unimportant information that wastes the group's time.

atmosphere that supports the constructive use of criticism, and (3) the lack of value given to creative approaches to solving institutional problems. Colleges and major administrative units were least different/most similar to the university in general in: (1) how they supported attempts to achieve beyond normal expectations, (2) attraction and loyalty, (3) accepting the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies, and (4) the acceptance of group values.

Comparison of primary work groups and the university in general. In a similar manner, greatest and least differences between these levels of organization were determined and displayed in Table 9. These differences reflect the combination of differences reported in Table 7 and 8 and reflect the pervasiveness of certain characteristics. These differences approach one full value place.

Responses by Years of Service

Responses were tabulated by reported years of service. The distribution of respondents is reported in Table 10.

Table 10
Distribution of Respondents
By Years of Service

Years of Service	Number	Percent of Total
Not Marked	48	9.8%
1 - 5	229	46.5%
6 - 10	69	14.0%
11 - 15	88	17.9%
16 - 20	44	8.9%
More than 20	14	2.8%
Total	492	100.0%

Analysis of responses revealed:

1. There was not a direct relationship between length of service and respondents' view of the effectiveness of various levels of organization.

2. Respondents with 1 to 5 years of service viewed the primary work group as "highly effective" on twenty-two of the twenty-five characteristics.

3. Respondents with 1 to 5 years of service perceived the various levels of organization to be more effective than did their peers with 6 to 10 years of service.

4. Respondents with 6 to 10 years of service viewed the primary work group to be "highly effective" on only half as many characteristics as any other subgroup.

5. As length of service increased bevond 10 years, the perception of the effectiveness of various levels of organization increased.

6. Respondents with more than twenty years of service held the most positive view of organizational effectiveness. They rated the primary work group "highly effective" on twenty-three of the twenty-five characteristics, and the college or major administrative unit "highly effective" on nineteen of the twenty-five characteristics.

Response by Academic Rank

Responses were tabulated by reported academic rank. The distribution of respondents is reported in Table 11.

Analysis of responses revealed:

1. More than one-fourth of respondents did not code academic rank. The suppression of identifying information by some respondents has been noted earlier.

Table 11
Distribution of Respondents
By Academic Rank

Rank	Number	Percent of Total
Not Coded	127	25.8%
Instructor	89	18.1%
Assistant Professor	81	16.5%
Associate Professor	52	10.6%
Professor	58	11.8%
Not Applicable	85	17.3%
Total	492	100.0%

2. Respondents who indicated that academic rank was not applicable tended to hold a more positive perception of organizational effectiveness at all levels than any other group on all except the characteristic relating to the selection of the leader.

3. The effectiveness of the primary work group was viewed more positively as academic rank increased; however, differences in mean values were small.

4. The effectiveness of colleges was viewed differently. Professors viewed the college most positively, followed in descending order by (1) instructors, (2) associate professors, and (3) assistant professors (least positive).

5. The view of the effectiveness of the university followed a descending order of academic rank. The university was viewed most effective by instructors, least effective by full professors.

Responses by Tenure Status

Responses were tabulated by tenure status. The distribution of respondents is reported in Table 12.

Table 12
Distribution of Respondents
By Tenure Status

Tenure Status	Number	Percent of Total
Not Coded(1)	200	40.7%
Tenured	143	29.1%
Non-tenured	149	30.3%
Total	492	100.0%

(1) Item was addressed to Faculty only.

Analysis of responses revealed:

1. Relative to the primary work group, non-tenured faculty were more positive than tenured faculty on twenty-three of the twenty-five characteristics. The exceptions were those items relating to the selection of the leader and avoiding unimportant information that wastes the group's time.

2. Relative to the college, non-tenured faculty were more positive than tenured faculty on twenty-four of the twenty-five characteristics. The only exception was the item dealing with avoiding unimportant information that wastes the group's time.

3. Relative to the university, non-tenured faculty were more positive than tenured faculty on each of the twenty-five characteristics. Tenured faculty viewed the university "highly effective" on only one characteristic, accepting the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies.

Responses by Administrative Level

Responses were tabulated by administrative level. The distribution

of respondents is reported in Table 13.

Table 13
Distribution of Respondents
By Administrative Level

Administrative Level	Number	Percent of Total
Not Coded	438	89.0%
President/Vice President	7	1.4%
Deans, Associate & Assistant Deans	5	1.0%
Chairpersons	20	4.1%
Directors/Managers	22	4.5%
Total	492	100.0%

Analysis of responses revealed:

1. The effectiveness of primary work groups, college or major administrative units, and the university in general were viewed in distinctly different ways by persons at different administrative levels.

2. Generally, deans held a more positive view of the effectiveness of all three levels of organization than any other administrative group and all non-administrators. Overall, deans viewed primary work groups and colleges to be "highly effective" and the university "effective to some extent."

3. Chairpersons held the least positive view of the effectiveness of college and university of all administrative groups and all non-administrators, generally rating colleges "effective to some extent" (3.16) and the university in general "effective to some extent," but to a lesser degree (2.72).

4. Chairperson's perceptions of the effectiveness of the university fell below the "effective to some extent" response value (2.50) on two of

the twenty-five characteristics: (1) "the leader and members believe each member can accomplish the 'impossible,' but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection" (2.40), and (2) "each member communicates important information fully and frankly to the group" (2.45).

5. President/vice presidents perceived colleges as "highly effective" (3.54) and the university in general as "effective to some extent" (3.03).

Responses by Support Units

Responses were tabulated for twenty-one support units. A complete table of responses is included as Appendix B. Respondents for each support unit included all administrators, and professional, technical and clerical personnel assigned to a particular office or activity. Four units had no respondents. "Highly Effective" and "Less Effective" characteristics identified by support units (1) for primary work groups are shown in Table 14, (2) for major administrative units in Table 15, and (3) for the university in general in Table 16.

Analysis of responses revealed:

1. Members of the support units viewed their primary work group as "highly effective" on six of the twenty-five characteristics: (1) trying to work harmoniously with others, (2) accepting group values, (3) meeting group expectations, (4) attraction, (5) confidence and trust, and (6) accepting important information as honestly and sincerely given.

2. Members of support units viewed their major administrative unit as less effective than the primary work group; however, they viewed their major administrative unit and the university in general about equal in effectiveness.

3. About half the support units viewed the process of selecting the leader of the major administrative unit and the university as "less effective."

Table 14
Characteristics of Primary Work Group
Most Frequently Viewed "Highly Effective" or "Less Effective"
By Support Units (N = 21)

Frequency	Characteristic
Highly Effective	
19	In working with others, members of my group try to work in harmony with the members of other groups.
19	The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.
19	Each member tries not to let the other members down and tries hard to do what he believes is expected of him.
18	The members are attracted to the group and loyal to its members and to its leaders.
18	The members and the leader have a high degree of confidence and trust each other.
18	Each member is interested in receiving important information and accepts it as being honestly and sincerely given.
Less Effective	
3	The leader and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible", but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.
8	The leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader.

Table 15
Characteristics of Major Administrative Units
Most Frequently Viewed "Highly Effective" or "Less Effective"
By Support Units (N = 21)

Frequency	Characteristic
17	In working with others, members of my group try to work in harmony with the members of other groups.
17	The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.
16	Each member tries not to let the other members down and tries hard to do what he believes is expected of him.
16	Each member is interested in receiving important information and accepts it as being honestly and sincerely given.
Highly Effective	
Less Effective	
4	The leader of the work group creates a supportive atmosphere and fosters cooperation rather than competition; for example, information is shared fully within the group.
4	Members feel free to communicate information to the leader, to suggest what needs to be done, and to suggest how the leader could do his job better.
10	The leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader.

Table 16
Characteristics of the University in General
Most Frequently Viewed "Highly Effective" or "Less Effective"
By Support Units (N = 21)

Frequency	Characteristic
15	The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.
13	The group accepts the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies on routine matters to save time and move ahead.
12	Each member tries not to let the other members down and tries hard to do what he believes is expected of him.
12	Each member is interested in receiving important information and accepts it as being honestly and sincerely given.
Highly Effective	
Less Effective	
5	Each member communicates important information fully and frankly to the group.
5	Members feel free to communicate information to the leader, to suggest what needs to be done, and to suggest how the leader could do his job better.
10	The leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader.

4. About one-fourth of the support units viewed upward communication to the leader of the major administrative unit and the leader of the university in general as "less effective."

Responses by Instructional Units

Responses were tabulated for thirty-four instructional units. A complete table of responses is included as Appendix C. Respondents for a given instructional unit included all full and part-time faculty, administrators, and professional, technical and clerical personnel assigned to a particular department or instructional program. "Highly Effective" and "Less Effective" characteristics identified by instructional units (1) for primary work groups are shown in Table 17, (2) for colleges in Table 18, and (3) for the university in general in Table 19.

Analysis of responses revealed:

1. Instructional units viewed effectiveness, at the several levels of organization to be lower than did the support units.

2. One instructional unit rated itself "less effective" on twenty-four of the twenty-five characteristics.

3. Four instructional units rated the effectiveness of their college below that of the university in general.

4. At all three levels of organization, instructional units identified the characteristic "the leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader" as the one characteristic least frequently present. At this institution, the practice of involving a search committee to screen, interview and recommend candidates for the position of department chairperson is a recent development; the majority of present chairpersons were appointed.

Table 17
Characteristics of Primary Work Groups
Most Frequently Viewed "Highly Effective" or "Less Effective"
By Instructional Units (N = 34)

Frequency	Characteristic
29	The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.
27	The values and goals of the group reflect the values and needs of its members.
27	In working with others, members of my group try to work in harmony with the members of other groups.
26	The group accepts the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies on routine matters to save time and move ahead.
25	Group members are effective in the communication and interaction between leaders-and-members and between members-and-members.
25	Each member tries not to let the other members down and tries hard to do what he believes is expected of him.
Highly Effective	
Less Effective	
5	The members are attracted to the group and loyal to its members and to its leader.
5	Each member communicates important information fully and frankly to the group.
6	The leader and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible", but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.
6	The group gives attention to important information and avoids unimportant information that wastes the group's time.
8	The leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader.

Table 18
Characteristics of College
Most Frequently Viewed as "Highly Effective" or "Less Effective"
By Instructional Units (N = 34)

Frequency	Characteristic
25	The group accepts the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies on routine matters to save time and move ahead.
23	In working with others, members of my group try to work in harmony with the members of other groups.
23	The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.
18	Each member tries not to let the other members down and tries hard to do what he believes is expected of him.
Highly Effective	
Less Effective	
5	The group gives attention to important information and avoids unimportant information that wates the group's time.
6	Each member communicates important information fully and frankly to the group.
6	The leader and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible", but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.
10	The leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader.

Table 19
Characteristics of the University in General
Most Frequently Viewed as "Highly Effective" or "Less Effective"
By Instructional Units (N = 34)

Frequency	Characteristic
18	The group accepts the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies on routine matters to save time and move ahead.
14	The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.
13	In working with others, members of my group try to work in harmony with the members of other groups.
10	Each member is interested in receiving important information and accepts it as being honestly and sincerely given.
Highly Effective	
Less Effective	
6	The leader and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible," but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.
7	The group has developed a well-established, relaxed relationship among all its members.
8	The group shares technical knowledge and training to help each member do the best possible job.
8	Group members are effective in the communication and interaction between leader-and-members and between members-and-members.
9	Members feel free to communicate information to the leader, to suggest what needs to be done, and to suggest how the leader could do his job better.
11	Each member communicates important information fully and frankly to the group.
11	The leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader.

5. At all three levels of organization, instructional units identified "the leader and members believe each member can accomplish the 'impossible,' but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection" as "less effective."

6. For the university in general, instructional units rated four characteristics specifically related to communication processes as "less effective": (1) communicating important information fully and frankly to the group, (2) feeling free to communicate information to the leader, to suggest what needs to be done, and to suggest how the leader could do his job better, (3) effective communication and interaction between leaders-and-members and between members-and-members, and (4) the group shares technical knowledge and training to help each member do the best possible job.

Summary and Conclusions

Conclusions from the study have been directed to two different areas: (1) those relating to the organizational climate of the subject institution, and (2) those relating to the nature of the instrument and the assessment process.

Organizational Climate

1. The reliability of the conclusions that may be drawn from the study is limited by the following: (1) the exclusion of certain subgroups from the target population (graduate assistants, service personnel, crafts and trades personnel); (2) an observed need to define "primary work group" with greater precision to assure that functional sets of interpersonal interactions are identified and assessed; (3) the response rate attained in the survey process (66.7 percent); (4) the observed suppression of descriptive information by some respondents.

Given that the survey carried institutional endorsement as one part of the self-study process, the failure to elicit a higher level of cooperation is indicative of a factor in organizational climate that merits further consideration.

2. The description of the "typical" primary work group suggests a highly effective work group with a strong internal influence-interaction system. Individuals (1) strive for harmonious working relationships with other groups, (2) try hard to do what they believe is expected of them, (3) are likely to accept group values, (4) have developed a well-established, relaxed working relationship, and (5) share technical knowledge and training to help each member do the best possible job. However, the characteristics present only "to some extent" are (6) trying to influence each other and being open to influence by others on technical matters, methods, organizational problems, and group processes, (7) communicating important information fully and frankly to the group, (8) attending to important information and avoiding unimportant information that wastes the group's time, (9) participating in the selection of a leader with obvious leadership ability, and (10) supporting member's attempts to achieve beyond "normal" expectations.

While primary work groups may generally be perceived to be "highly effective", the pattern of characteristics suggests that the group (1) seeks to avoid confrontation with other groups, (2) strives to maintain internal equilibrium by setting performance goals that are fairly easy to attain, helping members meet these goals, and withholding support from members who seek to do something more, and (3) controls internal communication by imposing group values without the full and frank exchange of information on technical matters and group processes. The typical primary work group demonstrates, at least to some extent, maintenance-level functioning.

3. The same set of characteristics are perceived most frequently present in colleges and major administrative units and in the university in general, although at a somewhat lower level at the university level. At both levels of organization, the "group" is perceived as (1) accepting the need to follow standard administrative practice, (2) accepting group values, (3) trying to work in harmony with other groups, (4) trying hard to do what is expected of them, and (5) being interested in receiving important information and accepting it as being honestly and sincerely given.

The least common characteristics, or characteristics present at a lower level of effectiveness, were similar for both levels of organization although the university in general was again perceived to be less effective. These characteristics were present only "to some extent": (1) support for efforts to accomplish more than accepted levels, (2) communicating important fully and frankly, (3) feeling free to communicate to the leader and suggest how the leader could do the job better, and (4) participating in the selection of a leader with obvious leadership ability. Additionally, colleges and major administrative units were perceived as effective only "to some extent" in the freedom of the group to act to achieve established goals autonomously. The university in general was perceived to be effective only "to some extent" in communication and interaction between leaders-and-members and members-and-members.

The apparent contradiction between the perceived interest in receiving important information and the perceived restriction on the interchange of communication, especially upward communication to the leader, suggests the presence of an informal communication network in which the possession of important information is a control mechanism.

4. Primary work groups are perceived to be most like colleges and

major administrative units on the following characteristics: (1) accepting the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies (3.72-3.68), (2) the perceived difficulty in differentiating between important and unimportant information (3.22-3.18), and (3) the absence of support for efforts to achieve beyond normal expectations (3.05-2.92). The primary work group differs most from colleges and major administrative units in the perceived presence of relaxed working relationships, greater sharing of technical information, more effective communication and interaction, a higher degree of confidence and trust, and a more supportive atmosphere.

5. Colleges and major administrative units are perceived to be most like the university in general in (1) the perceived level of support for efforts to achieve beyond normal expectations (2.92-2.83), (2) the presence of attraction and loyalty to the group (3.29-3.13), and (3) acceptance of the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies (3.68-3.52).

Colleges and major administrative units differ most from the university in general in the perceived presence of more effective communication and interaction, relaxed working relationships, sharing technical information, communicating fully and frankly, a supportive atmosphere, and feeling free to communicate with the leader; all perceived levels favor the college or major administrative unit over the university in general.

6. Greatest and least differences between primary work groups and the university in general reflect the combination of differences between levels and approach an item response value of 1.00.

7. The analysis of the responses of all subjects suggest another descriptive generalization: primary work groups are perceived to have strong internal influence systems, are perceived to control interation with other units by seeking important information but restricting the information they are

willing to share, are perceived to be units that accept the need to follow standardized practice but function with low interdependence. Organizationally, the structure appears to be highly "cellular" in nature with deliberately established distancing among units and levels of organization.

8. Analysis of findings indicated that a more positive view of each level of organization was held by (a) respondents with 5 or fewer years of service, (b) respondents with more than 20 years of service. (c) instructors as compared with faculty holding high rank, (d) non-tenured faculty, and (e) non-tenure track respondents. These results appear in conflict with the common-sense view that traditional academic rewards of rank (status + salary) and tenure (job security) provide satisfaction. Because these rewards are obviously time-phased, the findings suggest a need to relate current perceptions of organizational effectiveness to events in the institution's recent history to discover what logical relationships exist and provide direction to the diagnosis of possible organizational dysfunctions. Turnover rates in various positions should be examined to determine the institution's ability to retain quality personnel. Depending on the resolution of these questions, the large number of recent hires (46 percent of the respondents had less than 5 years' service) may represent a strong basis for organization development because of their strongly positive views.

9. Differences among administrators' perceptions of the effectiveness of various levels of organization also merit special attention: (1) the president, vice-presidents and deans generally viewed colleges to be "highly effective"; chairpersons generally viewed colleges to be "effective to some extent", (2) deans generally viewed primary work groups to be somewhat more effective than did chairpersons or primary work groups managers; (3) deans generally viewed the university in general to be more effective than did the

president/vice-presidents, and the chairpersons and primary work group managers. The less positive view of the chairperson may result from confronting day-to-day operational problems in what is perceived as a non-supportive environment. The more optimistic views of deans may lead them to minimize fundamental concerns emerging from the department level. These differences among perceptions suggest a work climate in which the several constituencies may find it difficult to agree on goals or objectives, or agree on the priority to be assigned to various tasks.

10. The possibility of analyzing the perceived characteristics of specific colleges and major administrative units, of specific departments and other primary work groups, and of the pattern of responses of primary work groups within major administrative divisions was precluded by the decision to suppress identifying data. The concern that such information was too sensitive, or too dangerous, or simply "not relevant to the purposes of our survey" reflects the skepticism and defensiveness Cameron found in the academic community. It also reflects a prime requisite for OD intervention: is the organization ready to look at the nature of its system of interpersonal interactions openly and honestly? In this instance, the response was "no, it is not". An enlightened OD consultant accepts this as an appropriate response for a given organization. However, analyses can be made for responses of "support units" as one category, and "instructional units" as a second category.

11. Characteristics most frequently rated by support units as "less than effective" dealt primarily with the process of selecting the leader at all levels of administration, vertical communication to the leader of the major administrative unit and the university, horizontal (member-member) communication, and the sharing of information. It can be argued that the

appointment of directors and managers of technical units has traditionally been a management prerogative; however, the positive effect that may be achieved by involving support personnel in search proceedings has not been tested. Of more serious concern is the loss of ability of the organization to correct or remedy problems when vertical communication is discouraged or ignored; when this occurs, the organization loses the potential to become self-correcting.

12. Instructional units viewed their own level of effectiveness, that of their colleges, and that of the university in general lower than did the support units. Members of instructional units, e.g. faculty, may be more aware of how an organization could or should function, they may be more self-critical, or they may hold higher levels of aspiration for themselves and for the institution than do members of support units.

13. One instructional unit rated itself "less than effective" on twenty-three of the twenty-five characteristics. Four other instructional units rated the effectiveness of their college below that of the university in general. Each of these instances gives the organizational trainer a clear signal of dysfunctions urging attention and in-depth analyses to discover reasons for these perceptions.

14. Instructional units identified three specific sets of interactions that provide clear guidelines for the design of the intervention process: (1) communication processes in the university in general, (2) the process by which leadership is selected and the effectiveness of this process at each level of organization, and (3) support for efforts to achieve above established institutional norms at all levels of organization. Institutionally, the question to be addressed is how to move from a maintenance-level organization to a fully-functioning organization.

The Survey Instrument

One of the purposes addressed by the study was to determine whether the survey-feedback process using the experimental instrument could provide an adequate assessment of organization climate. The instrument should be sufficiently diagnostic to elicit responses from members of the organization which identify the nature, degree, and locus of any organizational dysfunction. Remedy of the dysfunction obviously is the next logical step, but intervention and treatment were not within the scope of this study. The following conclusions are warranted:

1. Distribution of responses indicated that individuals in the target population were able to differentiate among the twenty-five characteristics selected as basic survey items. Although several characteristics relate to general processes such as communication, each characteristic appears to treat different aspects of the influence-interaction system.

2. Distribution of responses indicated that individuals in the target population were able to differentiate the degree to which these characteristics were present in the organization. Accepting perceptual differences among individuals, clusters of responses indicated strong to moderate consensus on the presence/absence of specific characteristics.

3. Distribution of responses indicated that individuals in the target population were able to differentiate among the various levels of organization. While the general tendency to regard the primary work group as more effective than more remote levels of organization, instances in which this tendency is reversed are indicative of major concerns for

organizational effectiveness.

4. With deliberate provisions to offset the cited limitations of this study, an institution of higher education can utilize the survey instrument with reasonable assurance of its diagnostic value.

Robert R. Dunwell
12-19-80

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cameron, Kim. Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education. Administrative science quarterly, December, 1978, 604-626.

Fox, Robert S., et al Diagnosing professional climates of schools. Fairfax, VA: NTL Learning Resources Corporation, 1975.

Francis, Dave, and Mike Woodcock. People at work: a practical guide to organizational change. La Jolla, GA: University Associates, 1975 (Blockage questionnaire)

Gibb, Jack R. "TORI group self-diagnosis scale" in The 1977 annual handbook for group facilitators. La Jolla, CA: University Associates, 1977.

Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and research in administration. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Halpin, Andrew W. and Donald B. Croft. Organizational climate of schools. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1963.

Harrison, Roger. "Diagnosing organizational ideology" and "Understanding your organization's character" in The 1975 annual handbook for group facilitators. La Jolla, CA: University Associates, 1975.

Harrison, Roger, and Barry Oshry. "Organization behavior describer survey" in The 1976 annual handbook for group facilitators. La Jolla, CA: University Associate, 1976.

Likert, Rensis. New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Likert, Rensis. The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Pfeiffer, J. William, and Richard Heslin. Instrumentation in human relations training. Iowa City, LA: University Associates, 1973.

Semrow, Joseph J. The use of accreditation. Boulder, CO: The North Central Association of Schools and Colleges, 1978.

Semrow, Joseph J. Accreditation: self-study and on-site evaluation report models for use by traditional and non-traditional institutions. Boulder, CO: The North Central Association of Schools and Colleges, 1979.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Fred D. Carver. The new school executive: a theory of administration. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Robert J. Starrat. Supervision: human perspectives. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

University Associates. Survey-guided development series. Hausser, D.L., P.A. Pecorella, and A.L. Wissler. Volume II, a manual for consultants. La Jolla, CA: University Associates, 1978.

APPENDIX A

NORTH CENTRAL STEERING COMMITTEE

TO: All Administrators
All Faculty
All Support Professionals
All Technical Personnel
All Clerical Personnel

FROM: North Central Self Study Steering Committee

DATE: April 26, 1980

SUBJECT: Characteristics of Work Groups Survey

1. The attached questionnaire is one part of the Committee's data collection. It is intended to obtain information about (a) institutional purpose, (b) communication, and (c) working environment within the University. The Committee strongly urges you to participate in this survey.

2. Each statement describes an important factor about a work group. For each statement, indicate the degree to which you feel this factor is present, using the following scale:

A	B	C	D	E
TO A VERY LITTLE EXTENT	TO A LITTLE EXTENT	TO SOME EXTENT	TO A GREAT EXTENT	TO A VERY GREAT EXTENT

Each statement asks you to do this for (1) your primary work group, (2) your college or major administrative unit, and (3) for the University in general.

3. Mark your responses on the enclosed IBM answer sheet; be sure to use a number 2 lead pencil. The separate answer sheets are processed by automated equipment which summarizes the answers in statistical form so that individuals cannot be identified. To ensure complete confidentiality, please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire or the answer sheet.

4. Although the Committee does not wish you to identify yourself by name, it will be helpful for you to identify your primary work group and major administrative unit. Use the first two spaces in the area on the answer sheet designated "Spaces for Student Number" to identify your major administrative unit using the following code:

00 University Library
01 College of Applied Arts & Sciences
02 College of Business
03 College of Education
04 College of Humanities
05 College of Sciences
06 College of Social Sciences
07 Administrative Services
08 Financial Services
09 Planning and Development
10 Student Services

Use spaces 3 and 4 in the "Spaces for Student Number" on your answer sheet to identify your primary work group using the following code:

INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS

01 Accounting & Finance
02 Aerospace Studies
03 Agriculture
04 Art
05 Biology
06 Business Education & Office Adminstration
07 Chemistry
08 Computer Science
09 Criminal Justice
10 Earth Science
11 Economics
12 Education (other than University Schools)
13 Education (University Schools)
14 English & Journalism
15 Foreign Language
16 Health, Recreation and Physical Education
17 History
18 Home Economics
19 Industrial & Technical Education
20 Library (other than Audio-Visual)
21 Library (Audio-Visual)
22 Management
23 Marketing
24 Mathematics
25 Music
26 Nursing Education
27 Philosophy
28 Physics
29 Political Science
30 Psychology
31 Sociology, Anthropology & Social Work
32 Speech Communication & Theatre
33 Continuing Education
34 Graduate Studies

SUPPORT UNITS

35 Advising Center
36 Registrar's Office
37 University Museum
38 Athletic Department & Coaching
39 Intramurals
40 Computer Center
41 Physical Plant Administration & Supervision
42 University Farm
43 Fiscal Control
44 Financial Operations
46 Purchasing
47 Inventory & Central Receiving
48 Personnel
49 Admissions
50 Alumni Office
51 News Services
52 Printing & Duplicating
53 Public Services & Publications
54 Financial Aids
55 Food Services Administration & Supervision
56 Residence Life
57 Student Development Center
58 University Center Administration & Supervision
59 Other

5. Return your completed IBM answer sheet to the Graduate Office as soon as possible. Thank you for taking time to respond.

ANSWER KEY:

A	TO A VERY LITTLE EXTENT
B	TO A LITTLE EXTENT
C	TO SOME EXTENT
D	TO A GREAT EXTENT
E	TO A VERY GREAT EXTENT

1. Group members are effective in the communication and interaction between leaders-and-members and between members-and-members.

   1. For my primary work group
   2. For my college or major administrative unit
   3. For the University in general

2. The group has developed a well-established, relaxed working relationship among all its members.

   4. For my primary work group
   5. For my college or major administrative unit
   6. For the University in general

3. The members are attracted to the group and loyal to its members and to its leader.

   7. For my primary work group
   8. For my college or major administrative unit
   9. For the University in general

4. The members and the leader have a high degree of confidence and trust in each other.

   10. For my primary work group
   11. For my college or major administrative unit
   12. For the University in general

5. The values and goals of the group reflect the values and needs of its members.

   13. For my primary work group
   14. For my college or major administrative unit
   15. For the University in general

6. In working with others, members of my group try to work in harmony with the members of other groups.

   16. For my primary work group
   17. For my college or major administrative unit
   18. For the University in general

ANSWER KEY:

A	TO A VERY LITTLE EXTENT
B	TO A LITTLE EXTENT
C	TO SOME EXTENT
D	TO A GREAT EXTENT
E	TO A VERY GREAT EXTENT

7. The more important something is to the group, the more likely the individual member will accept it.

19. For my primary work group
20. For my college or major administrative unit
21. For the University in general

8. Each member tries not to let the other members down and tries hard to do what he believes is expected of him.

22. For my primary work group
23. For my college or major administrative unit
24. For the University in general

9. Interaction, problem-solving, and decision-making take place in a supportive atmosphere; there are real and important differences of opinion, but conflict is not deliberately raised.

25. For my primary work group
26. For my college or major administrative unit
27. For the University in general

10. Group atmosphere is sufficiently supportive for the members to accept criticism and use it constructively; members are frank and candid, but feel secure.

28. For my primary work group
29. For my college or major administrative unit
30. For the University in general

11. The leader of the work group creates a supportive atmosphere and fosters cooperation rather than competition; for example, information is shared fully with the group.

31. For my primary work group
32. For my college or major administrative unit
33. For the University in general

12. The group shares technical knowledge and training to help each member do the best possible job.

34. For my primary work group
35. For my college or major administrative unit
36. For the University in general

ANSWER KEY:

A	TO A VERY LITTLE EXTENT
B	TO A LITTLE EXTENT
C	TO SOME EXTENT
D	TO A GREAT EXTENT
E	TO A VERY GREAT EXTENT

13. The group sets high performance goals for itself and for each member; each member accepts these goals and expectations willingly and without resentment.

37. For my primary work group
38. For my college or major administrative unit
39. For the University in general

14. The leader and members believe each member can accomplish the "impossible", but temper this expectation to avoid feelings of failure and rejection.

40. For my primary work group
41. For my college or major administrative unit
42. For the University in general

15. Members of the group give a member the help he needs to accomplish goals set for him.

43. For my primary work group
44. For my college or major administrative unit
45. For the University in general

16. The group values new, creative approaches and solutions to its problems and to the problems of the organization of which it is a part.

46. For my primary work group
47. For my college or major administrative unit
48. For the University in general

17. The group accepts the need to follow standard administrative practices and policies on routine matters to save time and move ahead.

49. For my primary work group
50. For my college or major administrative unit
51. For the University in general

18. Each member communicates important information fully and frankly to the group.

52. For my primary work group
53. For my college or major administrative unit
54. For the University in general

ANSWER KEY:

A	TO A VERY LITTLE EXTENT
B	TO A LITTLE EXTENT
C	TO SOME EXTENT
D	TO A VERY GREAT EXTENT
E	TO A VERY GREAT EXTENT

19. The group gives attention to important information and avoids unimportant information that wastes the group's time.

55. For my primary work group
56. For my college or major administrative unit
57. For the University in general

20. Each member is interested in receiving important information and accepts it as being honestly and sincerely given.

58. For my primary work group
59. For my college or major administrative unit
60. For the University in general

21. On technical matters, methods, organizational problems and group processes, members try to influence each other and are open to influence by other members.

61. For my primary work group
62. For my college or major administrative unit
63. For the University in general

22. Members feel free to communicate information to the leader, to suggest what needs to be done, and to suggest how the leader could do his job better.

64. For my primary work group
65. For my college or major administrative unit
66. For the University in general

23. The group is open to change, but only after carefully considering the need to change.

67. For my primary work group
68. For my college or major administrative unit
69. For the University in general

24. Members feel good about making decisions for themselves because members clearly understand what the group is trying to get done.

70. For my primary work group
71. For my college or major administrative unit
72. For the University in general

ANSWER KEY

A TO A VERY LITTLE EXTENT
B TO A LITTLE EXTENT
C TO SOME EXTENT
D TO A GREAT EXTENT
E TO A VERY GREAT EXTENT

25. The leader is carefully selected for obvious leadership ability; members have something to say about the selection of the leader.

73. For my primary work group
74. For my college or major administrative unit
75. For the University in general

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

PLEASE MARK ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF THE INFORMATION QUESTIONS BELOW THAT APPLY TO YOU

76. All respondents: Years of Service at the University:

A. 1 to 5
B. 6 to 10
C. 11 to 15
D. 16 to 20
E. 21 or more

77. Faculty: indicate academic rank:

A. Instructor
B. Assistant Professor
C. Associate Professor
D. Professor
E. Not applicable

78. Faculty: indicate tenure status:

A. Tenured
B. Non-tenured

79. Administrators: indicate level of responsibility:

A. President/Vice President
B. Dean/Associate Dean/Assistant Dean
C. Chairperson
D. Director/Manager

80. All respondents:

A. Full-time
B. Part-time

APPENDIX B

Distribution of Relative Values (Highly Effective, Effective, Less Effective) Assigned Each Characteristic By Number of Support Units (N = 21)

Item No.		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
PRIMARY WORK GROUP	HE	17	17	15	18	16	19	19	19	14	13	14	16	16	10	16	13	15	13	13	18	14	13	15	16	8
	E	3	3	4	1	3	2	1	1	5	7	6	5	4	8	5	7	5	6	7	3	7	7	5	5	5
	LE	1	1	1	2	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	3	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	8
MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	HE	11	12	14	13	11	17	17	16	13	14	11	14	14	8	14	11	14	10	12	16	11	8	12	4	7
	E	9	8	5	6	7	4	3	4	6	5	6	6	6	11	4	8	7	8	8	5	9	9	9	17	4
	LE	1	1	2	2	3	0	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	3	2	0	3	1	0	1	4	0	0	10
UNIVERSITY IN GENERAL	HE	7	7	10	7	10	11	15	12	9	11	10	9	10	5	7	5	13	7	6	12	6	4	10	8	4
	E	11	13	10	13	8	9	5	8	9	8	10	9	8	15	13	13	6	9	12	8	13	12	10	11	7
	LE	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	2	1	3	3	1	1	3	2	5	3	1	2	5	1	1	10

HE = Highly Effective (relative values greater than 3.50).
E = Effective (relative values between 2.50 and 3.49).
LE = Less Effective (relative values less than 2.49).

APPENDIX C

Distribution of Relative Values (Highly Effective, Effective, Less Effective) Assigned Each Characteristic By Number of Instructional Units (N = 34)

Item No.		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
PRIMARY WORK GROUP	HE	25	25	21	21	21	27	28	25	23	20	23	24	22	8	23	18	26	17	11	22	18	22	22	19	14
	E	8	8	8	12	12	6	6	8	10	12	8	8	9	20	8	13	6	12	17	9	14	10	9	14	12
	LE	1	1	5	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	3	2	3	6	3	3	2	5	6	3	2	2	3	1	8
COLLEGE	HE	8	9	11	10	6	23	23	19	13	8	13	9	11	5	11	14	25	8	7	21	9	7	9	6	5
	E	25	25	21	21	27	11	11	14	21	24	22	23	20	23	21	16	8	20	22	12	24	24	23	26	19
	LE	1	0	2	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3	6	2	4	1	6	5	1	1	3	2	2	10
UNIVERSITY IN GENERAL	HE	1	2	4	2	2	13	14	9	6	2	4	3	5	1	5	5	18	1	2	10	3	3	2	3	2
	E	25	25	25	28	30	20	20	23	27	28	25	23	26	27	26	24	16	22	28	23	28	22	28	27	21
	LE	8	7	5	4	2	1	0	2	1	4	5	8	3	6	3	5	1	11	4	1	3	9	4	4	11

HE = Highly Effective (relative values greater than 3.50).
E = Effective (relative values between 2.50 and 3.49).
LE = Less Effective (relative values less than 2.49).